

J. Gellibrand.

A

DISSERTATION

U P O N

TITHES.

With a Collection of Papers

imperfectly published in the Gentleman's
Magazine, in Answer to T. B.

Every Mans Law must be Consonant to the Law of God, and therefore the Laws of Princes, the Commandments of Prelates, the STATUTES OF COMMONALITIES, nor yet the Ordinance of the Church is not righteous nor obligatory unless it be Consonant to the Law of God. Doctor and Stud. Dal. 1. ch. 4.

But how are Subjects to carry themselves when such things are enjoined as *cannot nor ought* to be done? Surely not to *Accuse* the Commander, but *humbly to avoid* the Command—And when nothing else will serve the turn, as in things that may be done, we are to express our Submission by *Active*; so in things that cannot be done, we are to declare the same by *passive* Obedience, without Resistance and Repugnancy: Such a kind of *Suffering* being as sure a Sign of Subjection as any thing else whatsoever. *Usher's* Power communicated by God, and the Obedience required by the Subject.

Printed: And sold by T. Cooper, at the Globe
in *Paternoster-Row*, and at York and
Leeds, 1739.



Prints before the President.

[illegible]

Advertisement.

THE Partiality of the Author of the Gentleman's Magazine in discontinuing the Tithe-Controversy on my Part, at the time when T. B. my Antagonist declares, (1) *That he is willing to reason the Case with me as long as I think fit;* justly required this Publication.

I *Mag. March 1738, p. 137.*

The Reader is desired to correct the following Errors of the Prels, before he proceeds, and the literal Mistakes as they occur.

P. 10. Note 5. r. Pyle. *ibid*, Note 6. r. Beneficiary. p. 11. l. 39, for fair r. further. p. 16 l. 40. for to, read of. p. 20. l. 1 r. those. p. 23. l. 12, r. Swithin. p. 26 l. 40. for he being r. being. p. 30, Note 1. 19, for come at r. earn. p. 33. Note 4. r. T. B's 4th Letter. p. 37 l. 16, r. argues. p. 38, l. 32, for which r. and. p. 40 line 16, r. humane. p. 44 l. 9, r. apprehended p. 45 Note 1 r. p. 30 and Appendix. *ibid*, Note 3 r. p. 37, &c. p. 46 l. 16 r. p. 38, *ibid*, l. 12 r. p. 22, &c. l. 33 r. Conclusion, p. 47 Note 1, r. p. 31, p. 48, l. 8 r. those, p. 53 Note 13, r. 122, *ibid* 14, r. p. 37, p. 55, r. Remission, p. 38 r. believe,

Advertisement

THE Partiality of the
Author of the Gentle-
man's Magazine in dis-
counting the Trade-Contra-
dictory on my Part, at the
times when T. B. my Ance-
stors declares, (1) That he
is willing to reason the Case
with me as long as I think fit;
justly requires this Publi-
cation.

LONDON, March 1738. 4. 12.

Printed by J. Smith, at the Sign of the Crown, in St. Dun-
stons Church-yard, near the North Gate.

For Sale by J. Smith, at the Sign of the Crown, in St. Dun-
stons Church-yard, near the North Gate.



*Part of the Preface to the Brief Account of
many of the Prosecutions of the People
called Quakers.*



H A T the People call'd *Quakers* do profess a conscientious *Scruple* against the Payment of *Tithes*, and all forced Contribution for Maintenance of Ministers, and other religious Uses, is well known.

This their *Scruple*, we conceive, will appear not ill grounded, to such as shall duly consider the * *Nature of Gospel Liberty*, the † *Precept of CHRIST*, || the *Practice* of his Apostles, the *Usage* of the Christian Church in the first three Centuries, ** and the Testimonies of several *Protestant Martyrs*, †† and early Reformers from *Popery*, concurring to acquit them either of *Novelty* or *Singularity* herein.

And the many *Prosecutions*, *Excommunications*, *Imprisonments*, *Sequestrations*, *Seizures*, and *spoilings of Goods*, which they, for Conscience Sake, have undergone, are convincing Proofs of their *Sincerity*.

The *Prosecutors* of this People, for many Years, might
cover

* *Gal. v. 1.*

† *Matt. x. 8.*

|| *Acts xx. 34. 1 Cor. iv. 12. 1 Thess. ii. 9. 2 Thess. iii. 7, 8.*

** 'Tis impossible, saith Irenæus, to enumerate the free Gifts, which the Church all the World over receiving from God, in the Name of Jesus Christ, crucified under Pontius Pilate, daily dispenses for the Benefit of the Nations, neither seducing any Man, nor taking Money from him, for as she hath received freely, she ministers freely. *Irenæi*, lib. 2. cap. 57. *Oxonæ* Edit p 189.

Epiphanius joins *Tithes* with Legal Ceremonies, acknowledged by all to be abrogated. See Epiphanius p. 19. 20. *Paris* Edit. 1622.

†† John Wickliffe, Walter Brute, William Thorp, and others: See Fox's *Acts and Monuments*.

cover the Spoil and Havock they then made, under the plausible Guise of *Necessity*, and a *pretence*, that their Claims were not otherwise *recoverable*, than by Suits attended with *great Expence*.

But, since the Acts made in the 7th and 8th Years of the Reign of King *William* the Third, for the more easie *Recovery of Tithes, Church-Rates, &c.* Those that have made the former expensive Ways of Proceeding their *Choice*, seem to be left without Excuse, and to act upon other, less justifiable, *Motivès*, than the meer *Recovery* of their *pretended Dues*.

Prosecutions of this kind, do so nearly resemble *Persecutions*, that he who suffers by them, can scarce discern wherein they differ.

'Tis to be lamented, that the great Blessing of *Liberty of Conscience*, enjoy'd under the Lenity of the *present Administration*, should be frequently interrupted by such Proceedings: And indeed,

That Men professing *Christianity*, and some of 'em to be *Ministers of the Gospel of PEACE*, should, by unnecessary and expensive *Law suits*, sacrifice their own Quiet and Interest, to the Oppression and Ruin of their Neighbours, has been matter of Surprise to *generous Minds*: Inlomuch

That, when the *Case* of the People called *Quakers*, presented to the PARLIAMENT, did set forth, "that there
" have been prosecuted in the *Exchequer, Ecclesiastical,*
" and other *Courts*, in *England and Wales*, for *Demands*
" recoverable by the said Acts, above Eleven hundred of
" that People, of whom near Three Hundred were com-
" mitted to Prison, and several of them died Prisoners,"
Some Persons, of eminent Stations, seemed to regard that *Representation* as a thing scarce credible, " a bare Surmise
" of the *Quakers*," and requiring " a Specification of *Facts*" to support it.

For the Satisfaction of such, the following * Sheets are published.

— The ruinous Seizures for *Treble Damages*, and by *Sequestration*, for twenty or thirty times the Original Demand — will doubtless be shocking to most Readers; whilst the Expence attending the necessary Defence of almost

* The Brief Account, to which the Reader is refer'd.

most every Prosecution is not included; though in some Cases, even where nothing hath been recovered, the *Quaker* hath been obliged to expend Ten, Twenty or Thirty Pounds, to keep himself out of Prison.

Nor are those Prosecutions only ruinous to private Families, but nearly affect the publick Good; for how shall the industrious *Farmer* be capable of paying either *Rent* to his *Landlord*, *Taxes* to the *Government*, or his just *Debts* to his *Creditors*, when the whole Profit of his Produce, and sometimes all his Estate, both Real and Personal, is swept away by a *Sequestration* for the *Tithe* only? Or how shall an honest *Tradesman* keep his Family from becoming a publick Charge, while he is close lockt up in Prison, for conscientiously refusing to pay a *Groat* for *Easter Offerings*, or *Sixpence* toward repairing the *Parish Church*?

Certainly these *Wardens* are no good Stewards of the Parochial Purse, who spend many Pounds to Excommunicate and Imprison Men for such trivial Demands as they might have taken without Charge to the Parish.

Nor does it beget any *Reverence* to the *Discipline* of the Church, to see her heaviest Censures, discharged on such light Occasions.

Would not a *Gospel-Spirit* be more visible in her *Reproofs*, if they were seasonably applied to check the *Fomentors* of such *Unchristian Suits*, for their manifest *Breach* of the great Rule of *Morality* enjoined by *Christ* himself; **WHATSOEVER YE WOULD THAT MEN SHOULD DO TO YOU, DO YE EVEN SO TO THEM?**

A Dissertation upon Tythes, with some Remarks upon the Tythe-Bill.

THE learned Dr. Prideaux has fairly given up the Plea of Divine Right to Tythes; for he says (1) 'a Divine Right requires a Divine Law to support it, and there is no such Law to be found in Scripture, excepting that which was given to the Children of Israel, *which is a Part of the Mosaic Constitution, and is expired with it.*' But as (2) he thinks the Gospel has enjoined it a Duty on Christians to provide *sufficient Maintenance* for Ministers, to clear up this Point, we will examine the new Testament.

(3) When Christ sent forth his Disciples to preach the Gospel, he commanded them to provide nothing for their Journey; for, says he, the *Workman is worthy of his Meat.* (4) Also when he sent forth the seventy, he saith, *in the same House remain eating and drinking such Things as they GIVE, for the Labourer is worthy of his Hire.* By the Word *Meat* in St. Matthew, 'tis easy to conceive, that no more was intended than that the Disciples ought to have all necessary Accommodations of the People, *whilst their Time was taken up in the Work of the Ministry*; and that the Word *Hire*, in St. Luke, implies no more, is clear from the preceeding Part of the Verse, which explains it, *by eating and drinking such Things as they give*, and so the learned Dr. Samuel Clark understands it; his Paraphrase on the Passage of St. Luke runs thus, 'For as a Workman has a just Right to his *Wages*, so while ye are labouring for the Benefit and eternal Welfare of Men, ye may well expect to be sustained by them for *the present.*'

(5) The aforesaid Dr. Prideaux grants, that St. Paul refers to both these Commands of our Saviour, when he says, that (6) *as those who ministred about holy Things in the*

1 *Preface to the Orig. and Right of Tythes.* 2 p. 25. Edit. 1710. 3 *Matth. x. 10.* 4 *Luke x. 7.* 5 *Orig. and Right of Tythes*, p. 26. 6 *1 Cor. ix. 13. 14.*

the Temple, lived of the Things of the Temple, and those who waited at the Altar were made Partakers of the Altar, so the Lord hath ordained, that those who preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel. As therefore this refers to Christ's own Directions, it must be understood in the same Sense, that is, as the Apostles might reasonably expect kind Treatment, and sufficient Accommodations in their Travels; so St. Paul would have the Corinthians open hearted, and treat all Gospel Ministers in like Manner: He explains himself thus, (1) *Have we not Power to eat and to drink? have we not Power to lead about a Sister, a Wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the Brethren of our Lord, and Cephas? or I only and Barnabas, have we not Power to forbear working?* As if he had said, is it not reasonable that you should allow us *present Subsistence*, and necessary Christian Attendance, whilst we are in our Travels? It would be hard that we should be obliged to work for our Bread, whilst we are employ'd in preaching the everlasting Gospel of Life and Salvation to you; especially Barnabas and myself, who have laboured so much amongst you. But, as if some had made an Objection to these most reasonable Demands, he gives them up for himself, when he says, (2) *If others be Partakers of this Power over you, are not we rather? nevertheless we have not used this Power, but suffer all Things, lest we should hinder the Gospel of Christ.* As if he had said (according to Dr. Pyle) (3) 'But, however, to cut off all Objections from some of you, and to shew myself clear of all private Interest among you, I have not made use of my Priviledge, and had rather be in want of some Necessaries than insist upon it.' In like manner, in his farewell Sermon to the Church of Ephesus, he says, (4) *I have coveted no Man's Silver, or Gold, or Apparel, yea, you yourselves know that these Hands have ministered unto my Necessities, and to them that were with me.*

As I apprehend, that all other Passages in the Epistles, relative to this Subject, are of the like import with the foregoing, I shall only endeavour to obviate an Objection from the Case of Abraham and Melchisedec. (5) Abraham made a Present to Melchisedec, but that infers no Obligation;

1 1 Cor. ix. 4. &c. 2 Verse 12. 3 Pyle in locum.
 4 Acts xx. 33, 34. 5 Gen. xiv. 20.

Obligation; besides, it was not the Produce of *Abraham's* own Estate, but the Tenth of the Spoils taken in War; and that but for *once*; when Melchisedec had first presented him with Refreshments of Bread and Wine at his Return from the Slaughter of the Kings; and tho' the Author to the Hebrews says, (1) that Levi *paid* Tithes in Abraham, the Sense of the Word *paid* in this Verse must be settled by the *Fact*; and by two other Places; (2) in both which it is call'd a *Gift*. The Apostle, in his reasoning about Melchisedec, accommodates himself to the prevailing Notion of the *Jews*, which was, that Christ (whom Melchisedec represented) should be a most eminent Person: This Comparison suited his Purpose very well. (3) *Now consider*, says he, *how GREAT this Man was, unto whom even the Patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the Spoils: that he must be GREATER than Abraham: (4) for without all Contradiction the less is blessed of the greater; consequently CHRIST is Greater than Moses, and so Christianity is preferable Judaism.* This seems to be the whole Drift of the Author, and so one of the last and best (5) Paraphrasers upon the Epistles seems to understand it.

This Construction of Scripture is perfectly consistent with the Doctrine and Practice of the primitive Church. (6) Father Paul speaking of the Election of Ministers says, 'This Order of admitting none to the Ecclesiastical Functions, but by election of all the Faithful in a general Assembly, was inviolably observed, and continued so for about two hundred Years; the *Ministers of the Church* and the Poor subsisting all that while out of the Common Stock, which had no other Fund than the Offerings of the Faithful at their Devotions.——even so far down as the Year 340 the Council of Antioch ordains, that the Bishop, who had the Effects of the Church in his Hands, should dispose of them with much Caution, and in the Fear of God, for the good of the Poor and Strangers. That he should take *no more* to himself, than what *Necessity justly required*; alledging the Apostle's Words to Timothy, *having Food and Raiment let us be therewith Content; that*

1 Heb. vii. 9. 2 Gen. xiv. 20. Heb. vii. 2. 3 Verle 4
4 Verse 7. 5 *Pyle in Locum.* 6 *Beneficiary Matters. Ch. 3.*

' that he shall not keep the Remainder to himself; that
 ' he shall not give it to his Brethren, or to his Children;
 ' but that he shall distribute it according to the Advice of
 ' the Priests and Deacons; that if he does not do it, he
 ' shall be accountable to the Synod of the Province; and
 ' lastly, that if the Priests and Bishop be accused of con-
 ' spiring together, to appropriate to themselves the Eccle-
 ' siastical Revenues, the Synod shall examine this Accusa-
 ' tion, and punish them if it be found true.'

The Severity of these Canons clearly discover the gross
 degeneracy of the Clergy of that Age; the strong Resent-
 ment of the Church thereupon; with a plain Declaration
 what they accounted a proper Maintenance for Christian
 Ministers; nay, if we descend so low as into the middle of
 the 5th Century, (that dark and corrupt Age of the Church)
 we shall find Prosper of Aquitain, in this respect, an Aposto-
 lic Man, when he says, (1) 'a Minister able to live of him-
 ' self ought not to participate of the Goods of the Church;
 ' they that have of their own, and yet desire to have
 ' somewhat given them, do not receive it without great
 ' Sin.' Thus, we see, that Christ, his Apostles, and the
 primitive Christians, were so much against any such Set-
 tlement as Tythes, that they approved *only* of a *very mo-*
derate, voluntary and discretionary Maintenance, or rather a
bare Subsistence for the present.

But the Clergy will say, that as they dedicate them-
 selves wholly to the Ministry, and have no other Occu-
 pation, Tythes are no more than a *necessary Subsistence* for
 them.

The judicious Reader will observe, that this Objection
 is effectually answered already; for either (according to
 the Example of primitive Ministers) they should fol-
 low some honest Trade or Occupation, (and so Tythes
 would be needless) or, if they were really called *by the*
Holy Ghost (as they profess) to give up themselves wholly
 to the Ministry, surely Reason demands, that they should
 trust for Support by their Ministry, in such manner as the
Holy Ghost itself directs: But I am willing to indulge
 them with a *fair* Answer to this grand Objection of theirs
 and may justly remind them,

further

1st,

1st. That they had as much, or more, *Church Business* to do, when they subsisted entirely by the free Alms of the People.

2dly, That there is no Church Establishment in the Province of *Pensilvania*; that Country is not burthened with Tythes, neither is there any Maintenance for Ministers, otherwise than by the *free Contributions* of the People, and every Sect provides for their *own* Clergy; yet Religion is effectually supported amongst them, and they are as honest and wise as other Nations, and much more happy than any Tythe-paying Country in the World, because every Man enjoys the Fruits of his Labour, and can sit under his *own Vine and Figtree* and no one can make him afraid.

3dly, That the (1) Secular Clergy of the whole Empire of Russia (that vast Country) have no Tythes, but stand at the *Benevolence* of their Parishioners, and get a Maintenance by their Offerings, Shriffs, Marriages, Burials, Dirges, and Prayers for the Dead and the Living.

4thly, That all Protestant Dissenting Ministers subsist only by free Contributions from their own Churches.

5thly, And (what is very remarkable) the Church also confutes herself in this Argument; whilst the Clergy are continually *trading in Benefices*, wanting to change a worse for a better, and one for two, and at the same Time not allowing their poor Curates much more Wages than Day Labourers. Why? to help out, say they, the Curate has frequently the Benefit of a School; so that at last it appears that a Man may be of a *settled Occupation* and yet have Talents and Time enough to do all the Priestly work of the Parish besides. If five hundred Clergymen may subsist in this Manner, they all may subsist so; then no Occasion for Tythes. But when the Clergy cannot support their Cause by the *Gospel*, nor by *Reason*, they fly to the Plea of *Law*, as their *last Refuge*, (as if Law could make Black White, and White Black) for (say they) the Quakers scruple paying Tythes, because they are not of Divine Right, but they do not consider, that we claim them only by the Law of the Land. But the Quakers reply to this (as becomes all honest Men in such like Cases) that
for

for the preceding Reasons, they apprehend that this Law of the Land is **CONTRARY** to the Law of Christ, and so of Course inconsistent with the Gospel Dispensation; and, say they, *as Christ is our Supreme Lord, we are bound in Conscience to obey him rather than Man.*

This is perfectly agreeable to Bishop Taylor's Doctrine, (*Ductor Dubit. Book 3, Chap. 1.*) where he says, 'When divine and human Laws are opposed, these must always yield to those, and without Dispute, God is to be obeyed rather than Man; and although we must obey Man for God, we must never obey Man against God; and therefore it was excellently counselled by Ben Sirach,

Let not the Reverence of any Man cause thee to Sin.

But since the Clergy insist so much upon their civil Right to Tithes, I think it proper to enquire how they were first (1) introduced into this Nation. It appears (2) that Offa, King of Mercia, about the Year 794, made a Law, whereby he gave unto the Church the Tythes of all his Kingdom, to expiate for the Death of **ETHELBERT**, King of the *East-Angles*, whom in the Year preceding he had caused basely to be murdered on coming to Court to marry his Daughter. Thus, we see, that the *Foundation of Tithes was laid in Blood and Popery*: A most barbarous Murder of one Man is absurdly and superstitiously supposed to be expiated by a Robbery committed on the whole Body of the People. Afterwards Tithes were sometimes given in honour of the blessed Virgin Mary, and all Saints, and in Reverence to the Feast of *Easter*, or as a wholesome Remedy or Attonement for the Sins of the People; for the Church had published it far and near, that by the Distribution of Alms, Persons might be absolved from Sin, which induced King Stephen to confirm Tithes and other Church Donations. Thus by one idle Pretence or another the People were perfectly gull'd out of a

C

tenths

1. And they were introduced into Denmark by King Harold, Anno 1087, who gave great Power to the Bishops, and granted the Tithes of all the Revenues of the Country to the Clergy. at which the Jutes being exasperated, slew him at Odensea; but the Clergy, as an Acknowledgement of his Favours bestowed upon them, placed him in the Number of their Saints. Puffendorf's Introduction. &c. p. 289. 2. Orig. and Rights of Tythes, p. 164,

tenth Part of their Estates. I say a tenth Part, provided all Tithes were Glebes; but as they are so generally involved with the Labour, and such Hazards of the Husbandman, as cannot well be estimated in the Rent, I doubt, (all Things considered) the Deduction is oftentimes one sixth more truly than one tenth. If a Farmer lays out a large Sum of Money with a View to improve his Land, in Case of Success, the Parson reaps a considerable Benefit thereby; but in Case of Loss, the Minister is just where he was.— Again, if a Man purchases an Estate of barren, or Fen Lands, and is at a great Expense in draining them, or making them fit for Tillage; if his Project succeed, the Tithes are vastly augmented; but if the Gentleman loses all his Money, it is nothing to the Doctor: I suppose these Encroachments upon the Labour and Ingenuity of the People, were some of the (1) SMALL Occasions that Laymen took (in the Time of Henry VIII. and before) to withdraw their Tithes.

But for a more ample Discussion of this Subject, I desire to refer my Reader to Barclay's Apology, Pearson's Great Case of Tithes, and the Answer to the Parson's Plea; of which last Piece it is needful to say, that how much soever the Quakers applaud the argumentative Part thereof, as they disapprove the Invektive Part, it ought not to be charged to their Account,

Before I enter into my Remarks upon the TYTHE-BILL, it may be necessary to observe, that when the *Clergy* desired to have a Clause inserted in their Behalf in the *Affirmation Act*, empowering them to take the Value of the Tithes of Quakers by Justice's Warrant, it was proposed, that since they chose that Method as the easiest and most beneficial to themselves, that they should be *confined* thereto, and *restrained* from harrassing the Quakers in Courts of Law; but they objected to this Regulation with a good deal of Resentment, as carrying with it an Insinuation injurious to the Honour and Character of Clergymen, by supposing, that ANY of them were capable of chusing severe Methods, when they could come at their Demands by milder Means; which was the whole Reason why such a Restriction was not inserted in that Act.

I am

I am very Sorry, that their Practise since, made it impossible for them to offer the same Arguments in the late Debate upon the Tithe-Bill, but am most of all concerned to see them contending at this Day for the exercise of a Severity, which they once pretended to abhor even in Speculation, and the *Supposition* of which they treated as the *highest Reproach*.

As to the Tithe-Bill, I remember (ON A CERTAIN OCCASION) it was said by one, That he was for Liberty of Conscience in mere Speculative Points, but as that Bill affected Property, he could not agree to it. But if the Quakers Scuple of Conscience be considered, *with all its Circumstances*, the Clergy are no more affected by it than by a Point of mere Speculation, since they did not thereby ask for the Abolition of Tithes; nothing was desired therein, but that the *cruel Part of the Clergy might be restrained from ruining them*.

It was also said, that in looking into the Quakers Sufferings, they ought not to go further back, than the last twenty Years, upon a Supposition, that few Prosecutions have been carried on lately, so no Reason to ask for Relief; but if this were true, the Inference will not hold, because whilst the *Power* is in the Clergy, the Quakers are never Safe; 'tis the *mildness* of the Government only that gives them a Check, for *whenever the Government has been severe, the Clergy were always Tyrannical*.

It may well be Matter of Surprize, that for Proof of the Quakers Sufferings, Legal Evidence should be insisted upon, in a Case so notorious, and where every Body is certain, that the Clergy have Power to oppress. A Copy of a Process cannot always be had, and when it may, it would be very Chargeable to collect a good Number of them. If the Church of England thought the printing of their own (1) Sufferings was a sufficient Evidence of the Truth of them, why do they require more of the Quakers? The Quakers have published a *Brief Account of their Prosecutions* from 1696 to 1736, which the Clergy of London did their best to invalidate, by *palliating the Circumstances* of those Sufferings, in a Pamphlet, intitled, An EXAMINATION, &c. which is solidly refuted by

C 2

the

the Quakers in their Answer, intituled, A VINDICATION, &c. The Clergy reply'd to this also, but in such a weak evasive Manner, as rendered it almost needless to continue the Controversy. However, for the Satisfaction of the Publick, they pursued them with a short and full Answer; and I am perswaded, that every impartial Examiner of these Books, will conclude, with the Author of the Quakers Vindication, P. 124. 'That if the Clergy of other Diocesses, shall publish such Defences of themselves, they will thereby satisfy the World of their Inability to gainsay the Representation of the Quakers in any material Point, and fully convince the Legislature of the Necessity of the desired Restriction; a Restriction equally conducive to the Relief and Security of the conscientious and oppressed Quakers, and the Honour of the Church by Law establish'd, and the Reputation of her Clergy.'

When no feasible Objections can be raised against the *Circumstances of the Case*, then out comes the old orthodox Charge of *Obstinacy*, which was always brought against the Church of England by the Church of Rome, when she was in Power, for then Churchmen pleaded *Conscience, against the Laws of the Land*. Therefore, *Turpe est Doctori cum Culpa regarduit ipsum*.

But the Clergy ought to answer all the Arguments of the Quakers, and fairly convince them of their Mistake, before there is any Room for so foul a Charge; but, say they, the Quakers will not yield to the Force of Conviction! so said the Papists to their Fathers. But had Churchmen *Charity*, they would readily admit, that the Quakers refusal to pay Tithes is purely Conscientious. (1) * since no rational Man, considering his Circumstances and Family, would incur such severe Sufferings on any other Account. Besides, where is the Justice of charging a Man with *Obstinacy* only for his *modest Dissent* from his Neighbour in *one single Point*. If a Man is obstinate by Nature it appears by the general Course of his Conduct; but I knew a Man thrown into Prison for Tithes (where he lay several Years) remarkable for his good Nature and all social Virtues; so harmless he was, that he would not hurt a Worm; when I visited him in Prison, he spoke ~~not~~ of

the

the Affair, with so much tenderness, as carried the clearest Conviction along with it, that all his Fault was a *scrupulous Conscience*.

If it be said, that some Prosecutions could not be prevented by the Acts now in Force, the Title to the Tithe being brought in Question. I answer, the Quaker brought it not into Question first; but if the Parson begins a Suit, the Quaker is obliged to give his Answer into Court, or be committed to Prison for Contempt. So if the Law is defective in this Case, what says Reason? let the Law be amended. If it be objected, that the Quaker sometimes takes all the Corn out of his Field, and *locks it up* in his Barn, and so the Parson is obliged to sue him. On this Case it is to be observed, that the Quaker thinks it as ill to set out the Tithe as to pay it, so cannot confine himself to any particular ordering of that Part, different from the other Corn: But did the Tything-man bring a *Justice's Warrant*, he might open the Barn Doors, and take his Demands without any Resistance. But if it be said, that he cannot have a Warrant for *these Sort* of Tithes, when they exceed the Value of ten Pounds, then the Case is plain, that the Tithe Laws (as I said before) want to be amended, a Thing desired by the Quakers, but opposed by the Clergy, tho' such a Law might be comprised in a few Words. Confine but the Clergy to a Justice's Warrant for taking both small Tithes on the Premises, and great Tithes out of the Field, Stack, or Barn; by this Means the Parson will come at his Demands readily, and the Quaker would be greatly relieved.

Such a Bill as this the Quakers patiently wait for, and, considering by how great a Majority the late *defective* Bill passed in the House of Commons, and how small a Majority of the *Temporal Lords* were against committing of it, they (I believe) humbly hope, that some Relief will be granted them e're long.

In the Interim (I know) that they are truly thankful for the generous Intentions, and warm Endeavours, of so many noble Lords and Gentlemen in their Favour.

J. H.

A REPLY to two Papers in the Gentleman's Magazine for March and April 1737, wrote in Defence of Tithes; especially to the last, sign'd T. B.

IT's plain, that the * Drift of both these Authors, (especially the last) is, to rest the whole Cause in Defence of Tithes upon the Plea of *Law only*: They seem to look upon this as their Sheet Anchor, that will hold all Winds and Weathers. I may well therefore call it the Clergy's *last Refuge*, as I did in my Dissertation upon Tithes, printed last Year, of which we have but an imperfect Abstract in the Magazine for March, p. 155.

Laws are necessary for the Preservation of civil Right, and ought to be obey'd; unless, as the (1) judicious Hooker observes, 'there be Reason shewed, which may necessarily inforce, that the *Law of Reason*, or of God, doth *enjoin the contrary*.'

This is the distinguishing Circumstance of the present Controversy, which few consider; and thus I put it in my Dissertation, (tho' omitted by the Abstractor) 'That the Quakers apprehend that this Law of the Land, enjoining Tithes, is *contrary* to the Law of Christ, and so, of course, *inconsistent* with the Gospel Dispensation; and, say they, as *Christ is our supreme Lord*, we are bound in *Conscience to obey him rather than Man*. (2)

I

* For which Reason, and because no Reply was made on Behalf of the other Author, it was needless to take further Notice of his Paper. 1 Hooker's Eccl. Pol. Lib. 1. ScH, 16.

2. B. Burnet condemns Nonresidence and Pluralities on the very same Bottom, when he says, 'whatsoever Right the Laws of the Land may give [the Clergy] to them, yet certainly, according to the Divine Law, those who do not wait at the Altar ought not to be Partakers with the Altar,——how strongly soever (these Dispensations) may be in Law, yet they are nothing in Conscience. Past. Care p. 45.

I endeavoured to demonstrate in the former Part of that Paper, that Christ, his Apostles, and the primitive Christians (far from being silent, or leaving it as a Matter of Indifference) were utterly against any *established Maintenance* for Ministers. (1) Historians say of St. Jude, that he propogated the Gospel in Syria and Mesopotamia, *generally working as a Husbandman*; and died in the Year of Christ 72; which was after the writing of St. Paul's Epistles, and makes it as clear as can be, that hitherto the Church had kept to the primitive Institution. We also find, so low down as the Year 340, that the Council of Antioch decreed, that the Bishop (who had the Effects of the Church in his Hands) should take no more to himself than what *Necessity justly required*, alledging the Apostle's Words to Timothy, *having Food and Raiment let us be therewith Content*.

(2) In the Year 398 there was a Contest about this very Matter; the Messalians holding, that Ministers should not get their Living by Labour, but depend upon the Providence of God for Support from others. On which Aurelius, a Reverend old Bishop of Carthage, wound up the Dispute with these remarkable Words, 'That as the Apostle Paul laboured with his Hands, as Opportunity served, for his Livelihood, and that the other Apostles, as Time and Occasion permitted, used their Trade and Business, as *Clemens* testifies;—so we who attend on preaching the Gospel, neglect not at Intervals to do our Business; for some of us are Fishers, some Carpenters, and some Husbandmen, and are not not at any Time idle.' On which the Council of Carthage decreed, 'That all Ministers, how able or eminent soever they be, shall earn their Living by an honest Trade.'

Here, I say, was a formal Controversy about the Point in Question, and clearly decided in favour of the Quakers Principles; and is the *more* cogent, as it is *so long* after the Time of Christ and his Apostles. So that we may well conclude, that Tithes, or any settled Stipend for preaching, are quite Contrary to the *Christian Law*: —How then ought a Christian to behave, if Men make Laws opposite

to

1: Ecbard's Ecc. History, Ep. 2, Severinus Binus in Canones Concilii Carthag.

to the Divine Laws? Let the Circumstances of those Laws be never so plausible, he cannot *actively* obey them, without giving up that fundamental Maxim, *that Christ is his supreme Lord and King*. I say, whether Tithes are free Contributions, or no Contributions, whilst they are applied to the Support of Ministers, totally to exempt them from Labour, a Christian Man ought to stand still, and yeild *only* passive Obedience to the Laws of his Country, whatever Difficulties they involve him in.

Thus I have settled the main Argument against Tithes, which we should never loose sight of through all the windings and shiftings of subtil Men, and their inconsistent Laws with the Laws of Christ.

But for the Satisfaction of the Reader, I shall pursue the Adversary further. (1) The Reverend John Cooke (as he is called) seems to be very positive, that Christ, when he paid Tribute, had no regard to what use it was applied, 'Whether to the Maintenance of lazy Priests, or Idolatry, or the like. No, says he, (Page 134) he gave it because it was demanded by a lawful Authority.' But it cannot, in Reason be supposed, that Christ had no Regard to what Use the Tribute he paid was applied, to imagine that he would pay Tribute for the Support of Idolatry, is to suppose, that he would contribute to the destruction of his own Kingdom. Christ indeed medled not with Affairs *purely civil*, but yet he began his Religion with a free Publication of it to the World; which plainly shews the Distinction he would have made (had there been Occasion) betwixt paying towards the Support of civil Government, and the maintainance of Religion, especially an idolatrous one. All this is agreeable to the Sentiments of the primitive Christians several Ages after. (2) Dr. Cave says, that Tertullian told the Senate of Rome, 'That although they refused to pay the Taxes, rated upon them for the Maintainance of the Heathen Temples, yet for all other Tributes they had cause to give the Christians Thanks, for so faithfully paying what was due.'

My other more gentle Antagonist seems to admit, (Page 200) that our Objection of superstitious Motives, and superstitious

perstitious Uses, is a tolerable Objection, it being made against the Papists by the Protestants, when the latter alienated the Abbey Lands; but then (says he) nothing but Superstition *as great, or greater*, can justify a Man for not complying with the present Laws. Whereas it is not the *Degree* of Superstition, (that being almost impossible to adjust) but the *positive Nature* of it, which is sufficient in this Case: And what is Superstition in such like Matters will seldom be generally agreed upon, Christianity itself being once call'd so by the Heathens, and what the Protestants call so, the Papists call Piety and Devotion: So when the Episcopalians may think, that they have entirely removed the Objections, by new modelling the Uses to which these Donations were at first applied, the Quakers may possibly think, that the work is but half done, whilst the Tithes themselves subsist in any Shape; because the Remembrance of the original Claim is the better preserv'd thereby, and will the more readily be laid hold off, whenever the Church has an Opportunity, especially as a Person's Right or Title in them is still pleaded in the Name of the Church. But what is *most material*, and what this Gentleman insists upon is, that National Tithes are now no forced Contributions, nor indeed any Contributions at all, because both the Purchaser of the Land and the Tenant is allowed for them in the Rent.—But if they were forced Contributions at first, (and the People have never been easy with them) in Reason they ought to be esteemed so now. If it clearly appears, that my Great-Grandfather had Part of an Estate forcibly and unjustly taken from him, tho' another Man has paid the Value for it since, it ought *in reason* to be restored to me again. If indeed, thro' length of Time, the Right Heir cannot be found, either the Publick, or the Person in Possession of the other Part, should hold it; but in either Case it ought not to be applied to Idolatry, or to any Use, contrary to the Laws of Christ, as Tithes are.

That Tithes were Superstitious, and thereupon forced, at first; and that the People have been uneasy with them ever since, is (I think) undeniable, if it be only briefly considered, that Dr. Prideaux (in his Original and Right of Tithes, as I observed in my (1) Dissertation) admits,
D ' That

‘ That Offa, King of Mercia, about the Year 794, made a Law, whereby he gave unto the Church the Tithe of all his Kingdom, to expiate for the Death of *ETHEL-BERT*, King of the *East-Angels*, whom, in the Year preceding, he had caused basely to be murdered on his coming to Court to marry his Daughter.’ What can be a more wicked and arbitrary Introduction of any Law than this? When the Clergy had once got footing in one Part of the Nation, they made it their Business to promote a general Law as soon as they could, which is said to be effected in the Time of Ethelwolph, a superstitious Prince, by the Interest of *Swithen*, who, as (1) Rapin observes, instill’d into him an extream Affection for the Church and Clergy, wherein (says that Author) the *main* of Religion was then made to consist.

Lesley, in order to make the best of his Cause, in his Divine Right of Tithes, says, ‘ That this Law and Vow were confirmed and renewed by almost every King and Parliament that succeeded, in the Reigns of Alfred, Edward, Athelstan, Edmund, Edgar, Canutus, and Edward the Confessor, before the Conquest; and from William the Conqueror, down all the Way to Henry VIII. in many Parliaments, with solemn Curses and Imprecations upon themselves and Posterities, who shou’d detract any of the Tithes so vowed and granted; and such Curses and Excommunications were pronounced in the most solemn and dreadful Manner, by the Bishops, with burning Tapers in their Hands, in the Presence of King, Lords and Commons, in Parliament assembled, and all consenting, and confirming the same in the Name of themselves and Posterities. And, as it is expressed in the Act of Parliament made in the Reign of King Edmund, Anno 940, wherein all the People are charged upon *their Christianity* to pay their Tithes, and those who neglect it are declared accursed, (*i. e.*) excommunicated; and they were esteemed as Men who had *renounced their Christianity*, and not to deserve the Names of Christians.’

Thus far he: To all which a (2) Friend of mine replies;
‘ Observe

1 *Hist. of Eng. Vol. 1. p. 86.* 2 *J. Martin's Letter concerning the original of Tithes.*

‘ Observe here in what a superstitious and terrifying Manner
 ‘ the Law for Tithes was first imposed on this Nation;
 ‘ does this look like a Law founded in Equity, and assent-
 ‘ ed to by a free People; or rather a Bull of the Pope’s,
 ‘ issued out with the Thunder and Terror of the Vatican?
 ‘ If all the Lands in England were the King’s Demelne,
 ‘ and Ethelwolph had a Right and Power to confer the
 ‘ Tithes of all the Kingdom upon the Church, and was
 ‘ so minded, what need was there for his Vows? And if
 ‘ the Lords and great Men of the Realm did *voluntarily*
 ‘ *and freely* accept the Land at the King’s Hand, with
 ‘ this Clog upon them, what need was there for these so-
 ‘ lemn Curses and Imprecations upon themselves and
 ‘ Posterities? And if the People did know, that the
 ‘ Tithe or Tenth of their Lands, transmitted and passed
 ‘ from the Lords and great Men to them, was the *Cler-*
 ‘ *gys due*, and no more theirs than the other nine Parts
 ‘ were the Clergys; I say did the People know, and
 ‘ were really perswaded of that, then what need had the
 ‘ Bishops to pronounce Curses and Excommunications
 ‘ with burning Tapers in their Hands, in Presence of
 ‘ King, Lords and Commons, in Parliament assembled,
 ‘ and declare those who neglect to pay their Tithes ac-
 ‘ cursed, and Men who had renounced their Christia-
 ‘ nity.’ In short, we shall find the same Uneasiness among the
 People in the Time of Henry the VIII. and also in the
 Reign of Edward VI. to what else can be attributed the
 Laws for treble Damages and Costs of Suit, and other
 Severities in the Ecclesiastical Courts? And all this be-
 fore Men so much objected against them on a religious
 Bottom. Are not the People at this Day as much uneasy
 as ever? I am sure that many of them (who are not
 Quakers) think it hard, that they cannot improve a Farm,
 but the Parson will run away with Part of their *Labour*,
Ingenuity and Cost; for this is what cannot be rightly estima-
 ted in the Rent, and oftentimes makes the Tithe to be
 more justly computed at one Sixth than one Tenth, as I
 observed in my Dissertation.

We see, that the Country Curate (mentioned in the
 Magazine, Page 201) ‘compounded for his Tithes, to
 ‘ prevent Occasion of Misunderstanding with his Parishion-
 ‘ ers, it being very Troublesome to have his Eyes con-
 ‘ tinually on his Neighbours Yard, Swine-sty, and every

* little Hole, where his Calves and other titheable Animals were kept,

As to Purchasers, People are under a Necessity of purchasing, not as they would, but as they can; it is sufficient that they be willing to restore the Tithe to the right Heir if it were possible, or to apply it to some Service of the Publick, not inconsistent with the Laws of Christ. But because Tithes are thus unchristianly and forcibly settled upon us, does it therefore follow, that they ought never to return again to the People, from whom they were taken? The same way of arguing might have been used against abolishing Peter-pence: The right Heirs were not to be found; the Person who purchased the Estate was allowed for the Incumbrance, and so was the Tenant; and yet the Parliament thought fit to abolish that Law, and divers such like, whereof the Persons last in Possession reaped the Benefit; but before such a Law as this could be obtained, some of the (1) Lollards (to whom our Churchmen may be said to be Successors) were burnt, for not paying this very *Tax*, tho' it was then due by the Laws, as much as Tithes are now. So that they also made a Distinction betwixt a Tax for the Support of Government, and a Tax for Religion.

It ought to be remembered in this Place, that there are many Vicarages in England, where nothing is abated or considered in the Rent of the Houses, on account of these sort of Tithes, the Ministers demand, (by way of Easter-Offerings) lying upon the Inhabitants at so much a Head for every one in the Family that is a Communicant, or upwards of 16 Years of Age; a poor labouring Man, tho' a Dissenter, (one whom the Vicar knows has no Benefit of his Ministry) must pay so much a Year *for his Hand, or Liberty of working.*

Upon the whole then we see, that Force and Fraud introduced Tithes; and that (contrary to what my Antagonist says P. 200) the Government has *not* settled a Maintenance on the Clergy *without Injury* to any Man. It is not by far so equitable as in Russia, and much less in Pensilvania, that only free Country in the Universe. Therefore as Tithes were introduced by Force, and have been

been (more or less) supported by Force, I mean by severe Laws, to this Day, to the Injury and great Dissatisfaction of the People, they may justly be said (more or less) to be forced Contributions still, and as such, according to my Antagonist, ought to be given up. In this Case it is necessary to go further back than the *Reformation*, or *William the Conqueror*; the Reformers leaving this Abuse uncorrected, to which if William the Conqueror contributed any Thing, we know it was by Force, Spoil and Rapine.

(1) The long and lamentable Story of the Vicar's Misfortunes is entirely owing to his wrong setting out at first, and to the mischievous and erroneous Method of providing for Gospel Ministers. Had his Father put him Apprentice to an honest Tradesman, he might have saved his Money, and lived comfortably in the World, and been a Preacher too, if the *Holy Ghost* had called him to it, as he was obliged to declare at last before the Bishop, after he had spent so much of his Fortune; neither would he then have been involv'd amongst Persecutors (as he now justly is) because,

1st. He prosecuted a Man for Tithes, who refused to pay him *only* upon a conscientious Account.

2d. Because he might have taken as much as his Composition came to, either with, or, possibly, without a Warrant, without any Danger of Trouble from the said Quaker.

3d. If the Parishioners took any Advantage by what he lost in his Tithes by the Quaker, they ought to be prosecuted rather than him, because they had not the same Plea of Conscience to make.

And as the Vicar recovered treble the Value, besides Costs of Suit, this must, in my Judgement, be called a very severe Prosecution,

I am

1 It seems, that a good Part of the Vicar's Patrimony, which was betwixt 5 and 600 l. was laid out in his Education, for which he could come at no better a Living than about 60 l. a Year, his Father alledging, that he had no Interest with great Men to procure better Preferment for him, and that as for Merit it could do him but little Service, having observed Men of Parts, Probity and Learning, very ill provided for in the World. Mag. p. 100,

I am sorry to see my Antagonist, who talks so smoothly in the beginning of his Letter, resolve all the Plea of Conscience into nothing but *Sturdiness*; which is speaking as harshly as he well could; nor is it consistent with his own Words, when he says, 'That Difference in Opinion' is an Imperfection we shall in some Degree be subject to, 'after our best Endeavours used to remove it;' why then might not the Quaker be supposed, possibly, to be in the Right, and to act merely upon a scruple of Conscience, as much as another Man? Is this treating my Friend with a Spirit of Meekness, as he desires I should treat him?

However, my Gentleman assures me, he admits most of the Principles I argue from, 'and that he cannot think' of the Evils complain'd of but with deep Regret, and his 'View of writing is, with *my Assistance*, to discover the 'true Causes of them; and what, in Reason, ought to be 'done to prevent them.'

In my Opinion, these Evils are really owing to the Error of upholding Tithes, whereof, as soon as the Nation comes to be convinced, with removing the Cause the Effect will cease. In the Interim, I think, in point of Humanity, the Clergy should be restrained from taking ruinous Methods of Prosecution. If they can come at their Tithes easily, 'where is the great and grievous Inconvenience to them? How are they hurt? If a Law was made, empowering the Clergy to take *all sorts* of Tithes by Justice's Warrant *only*, where could the Damage be to them? the Quaker bears all the Charges, and the Justices are of the Clergy's own Church, who therefore cannot in Reason be supposed to take the Quaker's Part wrongfully. And why the Clergy should be against such a Law as this, when formerly they made no Objection to the Justices Power to fine, punish, and banish Quakers, from their native Country, is, to me, perfectly unaccountable, without supposing That as That Law gave them Power to oppress, This would take it from them.

The Quaker too, by such a Law, would be greatly relieved, for as he holds *passive Obedience* to the Laws of his Country, as much as any Clergyman; he would, by this Means, preserve a good Conscience, (being constrained to part with his Goods, though in this less ruinous Manner, as really as if they were taken from him by severe and destructive Methods) he might also maintain his Family

mily more comfortably, and be more useful in the Commonwealth.

This is my last Advice, wherein I have effectually provided for the Peace, Reputation, and Property too, of the Clergy, (as they think it.) Therefore, my good natured Correspondent, let me hope for thy Approbation, since we both of us think of the Evils of Persecution with so much Regret,

J. H.



Des

A Defence of the Quaker's-Plea against Tithes: In some Reflections on a Letter in the Gentleman's Magazine, for Sept. 1737, and sign'd T. B. wrote in Support of Tithes.

THIS Gentleman in his (1) first Letter on the Subject of Tithes, professing a generous Concern for the Sufferings of the Quakers, declares, that his *View* in Writing is, *with my Assistance*, to discover the true Causes of the Evils complained of, and what, in Reason, ought to be done to prevent them; to which I answered, (2) 'In my Opinion, (and for which I had given my Reasons) these Evils are really owing to the Error of upholding Tithes, whereof, as soon as the Nation comes to be convinced, with removing the Cause, the Effect will cease. In the Interim—if a Law was made empowering the Clergy to take *all sorts* of Tithe by Justice's Warrant only, where could be the Damage to them?—the Quaker too would be greatly relieved. To which my Correspondent now replies, (3) 'I do not ask, what *in your Opinion*, but what, *in Reason*, ought to be done.' But I not only gave my *Opinion*, but offered my *Reasons* for it. I proposed an Expedient which answered all the Ends that a *wise* and *good* Clergyman can desire; and which, at the same Time removes *the Evils complained of*; why therefore ought not this, *in Reason*, to be done? What does he mean by rejecting my *Advice and Assistance*, and yet (4) asks it afresh, without shewing the Insufficiency of my Scheme, or proposing another?

In support of Tithes, the grand Argument which this Author relies upon throughout his whole Discourse is, that *Government may settle Property as they please. without having any Regard to religious Considerations*. The Error of which is apparent from what I observed

1. *Mag* for April last, p. 199. 2 *Page* 26. 3 *Mag*. p. 541.
4 p. 543.

served in my last (Page 20) when I quote from Dr. Cave, that the primitive Christians refused to pay the Taxes, rated on them, for the support of Heathenism, for this Gentleman might have told them as justly as the Quakers, to this Effect, (Mag. p. 544, &c.) 'What is it to you how the Publick settles Property? You are no way concerned in the good or ill Application of their Taxes; it is no Merit or Demerit in You. Your Prosecutions are therefore owing to wrong setting out at first, and to a mischievous and erroneous Principle, that you are the only Judges how and in what Manner our Ministers are to be provided for, &c.' But for all this plausible reasoning the primitive Christians would not pay these Taxes, nor would they pay *active Obedience* to any Law which interfered with their Religion. On all such Occasions their common answer was *I am a Christian*; or else they talked in the Language of Tertullian, where he says to the the Senate of Rome (1) 'If I impeach your Laws of *Error and Injustice*, don't wonder at it, for they were made by frail Man, and not the unerring Wisdom of God.—' (2) 'Tis not *Antiquity* or the *Authority* of the Lawgiver, but an experienced *Usefulness* and *Equity*, that recommends a Law; therefore, when they have not these necessary Qualities, we have reason to find Fault with them, though *we find to our Cost* that they are still in Force.'

Wherefore it comes to this at last, that as the primitive Christians *then*, (and the Quakers *now*) never objected to the general or national Settlement of Property, in all *civil Cases*, (the Difficulties occurring therein being left undiscussed in the Gospel) yet as they refused to pay *Religious Taxes*, tho' settled in the very same manner as other Taxes were, so it only remains for me to prove, that *Christ, his Apostles, and the primitive Christians, are all firmly against any such Settlement of Property for Christian Ministers, as Tithes are*; for then, if my Reader duly reflects upon it, he will see, that our Author's Reasoning equally affects the primitive Christians and the Quakers.—for, what have you to do with the Settlement of Property, may be said to them both; wherefore if I sufficiently clear this

D Point,

Point, all this Gentleman's reasoning from the Anabaptists making a wrong Inference from some Places of Scripture (if he charges them truly) comes to nothing; and also all that he says about Property: And this is what I shall endeavour to make appear more fully than in my last, in which I should then have been more explicit, but merely for brevity's Sake, and because I thought that my *Dissertation* (which was left at the Printer's) had come to my Correspondent's Hands, as well as to the Hands of many others.

I there shew, that (1) Christ and his Apostles have recommended only a voluntary and moderate Subsistence for Ministers, during such Part of their Time as they are engaged in the Work of the Ministry, and this not to be insisted upon where it is not freely offered; in opposition to all established Maintenance for Ministers as such Tithes are, which as I shewed in my last, were introduced into this Nation by Force and Fraud, and have ever since been supported by extraordinary severe Laws, and may therefore justly be said to be forced Contributions still, for which Reason these Words,

1 That this Doctrine is perfectly consistent with the moral Reason of Things, so great an Ecclesiastic as the Archbishop of Cambray acknowledges, in his Dialogues concerning Eloquence, particularly that Kind that is fit for the Pulpit, p. 32, 38. As 'an Orator's Aim should be to make People more Wise and Virtuous, he should have nothing to hope or fear from his Hearers with regard to his own Interest. If you allowed of ambitious mercenary Declaimers, do you think they would oppose all the foolish unruly Passions of Men? If they themselves be subject to Avarice, Ambition, Luxury, and such shameful Disorders, will they be able to cure others? If they seek after Wealth, can they be fit to disengage others from that mean Pursuit? I grant, that a virtuous and disinterested Orator, ought always to be supplied with the Conveniencies of Life; nor can he ever want them, if he be a true Philosopher: I mean, such a wise and worthy Person as is fit to reform the Manners of Men, for then he will live after a plain, modest, frugal, laborious Manner. He will have Occasion but for little, and that little he will never want, tho' he should ~~come~~ ^{earn} it with his own Hands. Now what is Superfluous ought not to be offered him, as a Recompence for his publick Services, and indeed it is not worthy of his Acceptance.

earn

Words, *established Maintenance* and *forced Contributions*, when applied to Tithes, are convertible Terms, and carry the very same Idea with them. When I say *Whether Tythes are free Contributions or no Contributions* it is merely in Condescension to my Antagonist, my Meaning is, that as they are appointed in a *Manner different* to what Christ, his Apostles, and the primitive Church direct, (*call them what he will*) they cannot be submitted to, without breaking that fundamental Law of Christianity, of regarding Christ as our *supreme Lord and King in religious Matters*; so that this no way affects any wealthy Quaker who preaches the Gospel freely. (1) 'When Christ sent forth his Disciples to preach the Gospel, he commanded them to provide nothing for their Journey, for, says he, *the Workman is worthy of his Meat*. Also when he sent forth the Seventy, he says, *in the same House remain eating and drinking such Things as they GIVE, for the Labourer is worthy of his Hire*. By the Word *Meat* in St. Matthew, 'tis easy to conceive, that no more was intended, than that the Disciples might reasonably expect all necessary Accommodations of the People they preached to, whilst their Time was taken up in the Work of the Ministry.' For we cannot extend it further, without putting great Violence upon these remarkable Words of our Lord (2) *freely ye have received, freely give*. (3) 'And that the word *Hire* in St. Luke implies no more is clear from the preceding Part of the Verse, which explains it by these emphatical Words, *eating and drinking such Things as they GIVE*, and so the learned Dr. Samuel Clark understands it; his Paraphrase on the Passage of St. Luke runs thus, "For as a Workman has a just Right to his Wages, so while ye are labouring for the Welfare and eternal Benefit of Men, ye may well expect to be sustained by them for the present."

(4) The learned Dr. Prideaux grants, that St. Paul refers to both these Commands of our Saviour, when he says, (5) that *as those who ministered about holy Things in the Temple, lived of the Things of the Temple, and those who waited at the Altar, were made Partakers of the Altar,*

D 2

' so

1 *Dissertation* p. 8. 2 *Mattb. x. viii.* 3 *Dissert.* p. 8.
 4 *Original and Right of Tithes*, p. 26. 5 *1 Cor. ix. 13, 14.*

' so the Lord hath ordained, that those who preach the Gospel, shall live of the Gospel.' As therefore these words, *and so the Lord hath ordained*, have reference to Christ's own Directions, they must be understood in the same Sense, and are a Key to this Chapter, and to all such like Passages in the new Testament, and therefore the most extensive Construction that this Text will admit of is, that as the Apostles might reasonably expect kind Treatment and sufficient Accommodations in their Travels, so St. Paul would have the Corinthians open hearted, and treat all Gospel Ministers in like Manner. He explains himself thus, (1) *Have we not Power to eat and drink? have we not Power to lead about a Sister, a Wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the Brethren of our Lord, and Cephas? or I only and Barnabas, have we not Power to forbear working?* As if he had said, is it not reasonable that you should allow us present Subsistence, and necessary Christian Attendants, whilst we are in our Travels, as well as the Brethren of the Circumcision? it would be hard that we should be obliged to work for our Bread whilst we are employed in preaching the everlasting Gospel of Life and Salvation to you, especially Barnabas and myself, who have laboured so much amongst you. Agreeable to this Construction Dr. Pyle paraphrases that saying of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the Mouth of the Ox that treadeth out the Corn. 'Tis there commanded, says he, Deut. xxv. 4, that the very Ox that labours in treading the Corn, should be suffered to eat the Corn, whilst he was at the Labour, so that this Power to live of the Gospel, by the free Offerings of Christians, is not a Right to constant Maintenance, because a Minister may happen to preach among them once a Week, but only a reasonable Expectation to have present Subsistence for his daily Labour amongst them. Nor has Christ told his Disciples, as my Correspondent very positively asserts, (2) that *they need not labour*, for he has expressly provided that in Case the People did not receive them, that is (as Dr. Clark paraphrases it) *refused to entertain them*, they were not to make a Clamour about Maintenance, much less take any Method to oblige them to it, but only to (3) *shake off the Dust of their Feet, and so depart*, which necessarily might oblige

oblige them sometimes to *work for their Living*. When St. Paul, writing to Timothy, says (1) *meditate on these Things, give thy self up wholly up to them*, (2) *No Man that warreth entangleth himself with the Affairs of this Life*, he tells him not, that, because it might be his Duty to dedicate himself entirely to the Service of Ministry, therefore he may justly expect a fine rich Bishoprick, but on the contrary reminds him, (3) *that Godliness with Contentment is great Gain*, and if he had but Food and Raiment to be therewith Content. As much as to say, in all likelihood those to whom thou administres spiritual Things will administer sufficient temporal Things again, so far as Food and Raiment, with which I advise thee to be Content, and great shall be thy Reward in the Kingdom of Heaven. It is thus that Origen, Chrysostom, Jerom and the Council of Antioch directly apply these Texts.

Here permit me to correct a Mistake of our Author, (4) where he seems to think, that I account it a Sin to apply ones Mind to the natural and ordinary Means of Improvement in religious Knowledge; No: What I hold in this Case is, that Learning is not *absolutely necessary* to qualify a Man for the Ministry, and that the Sin lies in making a (5) Trade of it, as I have been shewing. (6) I find that the better Sort of Gentiles did continually upbraid the primitive Christians, that their Teachers were *Weavers or Combers of Wool, Coblers, Fullers, illiterate and exceeding Rustick*; which very well agrees with the Canon of the Council of Carthage, mentioned in my last, ordering

1. 1 Tim. iv. 15. 2. 2 Tim. ii. 4. 3. 1. Tim. vi. 6. 8. &c
 4. T. B.'s Letter stands as a Reply to me from this Place, which in Mag. for March 1738, is called the Conclusion of the Quakers Plea against Tithes.

5. In degenerate Ages Men run into [holy Orders] as to a Subsistence, or the Means of procuring it, and seem to have no other Sense of that sacred Institution, than Mechanics have of obtaining their Freedom or Company in which they have passed their Apprenticeship. It were indeed happy for the Church, if those who offer themselves to Orders, had but such a Sense of them as Tradesmen have of their Freedom, &c. Past. Care, p. 50.

6. Herald Animad. in Arnob. Lib. 3. p. 139. And Orig. p. 144. Camb. Edit.

4.

ing Ministers to work for their Living, by which it looks as if they thought just as I do.

As to those Texts in the second Col. Mag. p. 542, I having obviated this Author's reasoning upon them, in the beginning of this Paper, need here only observe, that (1) the Abstracter has taken them from the Preface to the (2) *Brief Account* of the Quakers Sufferings, where they are well applied to shew the Nature of Gospel Liberty, the Doctrine of Christ, and the Practice of the Apostles, relating to the Subsistence for Gospel Ministers; at least what Paul very much recommended by his own Example, which was, that it would be more Honourable for Ministers not to be chargeable to the Church in any Respect, or as little as possible.

And now having prov'd, that Christ and his Apostles allowed only of a *discretionary, moderate, and voluntary Maintenance*, for Ministers, I shall further observe, (by way of Corroboration and Confirmation of my Construction of Scripture) that (3) Father Paul, an honest and judicious Historian, asserts, 'that for about 200 Years the Ministers of the Church and the Poor subsisted out of the *common Stock*; which had no other Fund, than the Offerings of the Faithful.' And (4) Bishop Burnet, speaking of the Apostacy of the primitive Church, in relation to Priests and Bishops says, 'it was occasioned partly by the Tyranny of some Bishops (to which Bounds were set by the Laws and Canons) and partly by having a *special Property and Benefice of their own*, and not being maintained by a Dividend out of the *common Stock* of the Church as at first.' These Abuses and Corruptions creeping into the Church, Councils were obliged to enforce primitive Doctrine and Practice as much as they could: It was for such like Reasons as these, that the Council of Antioch, in the Year 340, ordained, that the Bishop should with much Care and Caution distribute the Effects of the Church amongst the poor and Strangers, taking no more for himself and the other Ministers, than what *Necessity justly required*, alledging the Apostles words

to

1 *Mag* for March 1737, p. 154. 2 *Now printed in the Author's own Words*, (supposed to be I B. of London p. 5. 3 *Benef. Matters*, ch. 3. 4 *Pass. Care*, p. 94, Edit. 3.

to Timothy, *having Food and Raiment let us be therewith Content.* Then comes the Council of Carthage, so *low down* as the Year 398, when many Corruptions were crept into the Church, yet Christians bent themselves strenuously at that Time to restore primitive Discipline, by enjoining Ministers to follow some Occupation; it is remarkable too, that the (1) Messalians, who pleaded against Aurelius, that the Clergy should be wholly exempted from Labour, were at that Time accounted (2) Hereticks. My Antagonist is pleated to say, that this Decree is *Contradictory* to Scripture; of which the judicious Reader may judge, when he has considered the Reasonableness of my Construction of Scripture Texts, as being perfectly consistent with one another, and are also as conformable to the constant Usage of the primitive Church, and to the Decree of the Council of Antioch, which is much to the same Effect with this Canon. It is a most egregious Misapprehension of this accute Reasoner, not to discern, that the *lower down* a primitive Custom is afresh enjoin'd the *greater Weight* such Decree carries with it, especially when the Decree is constituted purposely to correct an Abuse growing upon the Church. How would he have triumphed over me could he have prov'd that Tithes, or any fix'd Maintainance for Ministers, were not only from the Beginning of Christianity, but continued incontestible so *low down* as the Year 398, and then some Hereticks opposed that kind of Settlement, but were rebuked with a Decree of that eminent Council of Carthage. But further, becaule I am desirous to open his Eyes, and to let him see, that all Protestants (as he thinks (3) are not of his Mind, about the *lateness* of this Decree, I recommend him to Bishop Burnet's Instruction, who speaking of some Canons made in several Ages, relating to the Duties and Labours of the Clergy, says expressly, (4) 'I go next to a worse Scene of the Church, (always the later the worse) to see what Provisions were made in this Matter [of Pluralities] About the 8th Century, *the worse that those Ages and Councils were, it makes the Argument*

1 *Secundum Notas Sacerdotum Bini in Canones Consilii Carthag. prædicti.* Or 2. *Augustin in Op. Monach.* 31.

3 *Mag.* p. 543;

4 *Past. Care,* 76,

" *argument the Stronger, since even bad Men in bad Times*
 " *could not justify or suffer such an Abuse.* In the Year 787,
 " the second Council of Nice was held, that settled the
 " *Worship of Images.* The 15th Canon of it runs thus,
 " *No Clerk shall from henceforth be reckoned in two*
 " *Churches, for this is the Character of Traffick and Co-*
 " *vetousness, and wholly estranged from the Ecclesiastical*
 " *Custom.*—For these Things which filthy Lucre has
 " brought into Church Matters are contrary to God.
 " *There is a variety of Employments for acquiring the ne-*
 " *cessary Supplies of this Life; let every one that pleases*
 " *make use of these for furnishing himself—for the Apostle*
 " *said, these Hands have ministred to my Necessities, and to*
 " *those that were with me.*" All which is a strong Defence
 for the Council of Carthage, and incontestibly confirms my
 Reasoning. But I am call'd upon to answer this Question;
 will you be decided by Councils and their Decrees in this
 and other Cases? To which I answer, Yes, when they
 are so perfectly agreeable to Scripture and to one another
 as these are about the Point in Question. Besides, as this
 is a way of arguing that the Clergy lay a great Stress up-
 on, when they think it suits their Purpose, it must ne-
 cessarily be conclusive against them here. Well then, this
 being the Doctrine and Discipline of the primitive Church,
 any Settlement of Property contrary to it cannot be ap-
 proved of by those who love original Christianity; they
 can do no more than quietly submit to such Laws by *pas-*
sive Obedience, till a Reformation can be brought about,
 and that which was taken from the People in such a terri-
 fying Manner (as I shewed in my last) be restored to them
 again, or applied to some Use not inconsistent with the
 Gospel.

But this Author says (1) Tithes cannot be taken away,
 because the Heirs are extinct; but at that Rate they could
 not have been justly taken from the Popish Clergy, the
 Heirs being extinct long before the Reformation. Where-
 fore since this Gentleman allows, that the Power of settling
 Property rests in the Parliament, and as they settled
 Tithes at first, why can they not unsettle them again?
 they have once already taken them entirely from a Se. of
 Men

Men, who assume to themselves the Character of Ministers of the Gospel, and have given them to another Set who claim the same Title; why can they not with as much Reason and Equity restore them again to the People from whom they were originally taken in a fraudulent Manner? What this Author said (1) about superstitious Uses, I took to be a Justification of the Protestants for taking away the Abbey-Lands from the Papists, arguing from thence, that the Quakers must shew that they are now applied to as great or greater superstitious Uses, before they ought to object to the new Regulation. On which I gently observed, that the precise Degree of Superstition was of no great Importance, and that I wished they had been better regulated. His Words (2) are, *admitting all this*; yet he now says, *he did not admit*, but argues, that if the Law allowed of Alienations made upon such Motives and such Uses, the Title must be valid; to which I only object as before, that the *Uses and old Circumstances of those Tithes* should be entirely changed, which cannot be said to be done, whilst the Title and Process proceeds from the Church, and a Reservation is made out of the Rent of many of them for Ecclesiastical Uses. However, if I still misapprehend him, this is far from being my main Objection, as is plain, when I say (p. 21) but what is *most material*, and what this Gentleman insists upon is, that National Tithes are no forced Contributions, nor indeed any Contributions at all. All which I largely prov'd against him; to which I can see nothing like a Confutation, without he will call these Words so. (3) where he tells me, the direct contrary appears from my own Account of the Matter; and then hints how that I have shewed, that they were really introduced by Offa in a wicked Manner, and supported ever since by terrifying Laws; or these Words, where he asserts, that Ministers are provided for without the Assistance of the People, and yet neglects to shew the (4) Equity of the preceeding Laws, or that the Labour of the Husbandman, may be

E fairly

1 Mag. p. 200: 2 p. *ibid.* 3 p. 544.

4 The whole of the Question is, whether the Laws we defend be Good and Just, Equitable and Righteous, and not whether they be Laws of the Land or not. Bangor's Com. Rights, &c. p. 4.

fairly and readily estimated in the Rent. In Places where there is any considerable Tract of Tithe-free-Land, notwithstanding the Rent is *proportionably advanced*, (as the Clergy love to Reason) the Farmers are much easier, and the Lands kept in much better Heart, and the Corn is generally cheaper, than in other Markets in Titheable Places, which would not be, if the Labour, Ingenuity and Cost of the Farmer, could be rightly estimated in Titheable Lands, which is the Reason, that this has always been a Source of much Uneasiness. Let me observe too, if wet Lands are to be drained, or barren Lands manured at great Charge, or Inclosures made of ordinary Lands that never paid Tithe, in all these Cases the Clergy partake of the Profit, but bear no Share of the Loss, in Case of ill Success; which is very Unequal, and is a great Discouragement to the Laity to endeavour at such Improvements, which of Consequence must needs be a considerable Loss to the National Interest.

This Author too has quite slip'd over my Objections about the unreasonableness of Easter Offerings in Vicarages, which I look upon to be very material, as they are placed intirely upon the Inhabitants, tho' the major Part may be Dissenters, who reap no Benefit at all from the Ministry of the Vicar, or have any Abatement in the Rent of their Houses, &c.

and

None of my Difficulties are resolv'd, yet he goes about to run me down, with telling me, that from my own Arguments it appears, that the Government has settled a Maintenance on the Clergy without Injury to any Man. He asserts indeed, that Tithes were settled *freely* on the Clergy at the Time of the Reformation; that is, they were settled by Parliament, ~~by which~~ so they had been before, but how does it appear, that the *People were easy* with them at the Reformation? (for that is the main Consideration in this Case) when there was so much Occasion to make Law after Law to bring them to Obedience, and nothing would do till the Parliament made it a Forfeiture of treble the Value of the Tithe, besides Costs of Suit. This indeed, as the Author of the (1) Parson's Plea observes, cured the People of their *perverse Will*, which

which was just such a way of Conviction, as the Statute for burning off Hereticks, by terrifying many poor Protestants to *abjure their Faith*, to save their Bodies from unrelenting Flames.

This Author, instead of invalidating my three Reasons for fixing Persecution upon the Country Vicar, runs off the Point, and tells me I want Candour and Compassion, in charging him with wrong setting out at first; but where is the Harm of that, when my Argument necessarily led me to conclude so, and which I then, and now again, have proved.

But since my Correspondent makes such a heavy Complaint, that his Friend, the Vicar, should be at so great Expence in qualifying himself for the Ministry, and yet be able to come at no better a LIVING than 60 l. a Year, and that attended with much Trouble, I think it not amiss (as being disposed to deal tenderly with him) to send him to a Bishop of his own Church for a Reprimand.

(1) ' The capital Error (says he) in Men's preparing themselves for that [holy] Function is, that they study Books more than themselves, and that they read Divinity more in other Books than in the Scriptures.—Ask yourselves often, would you follow that Course of Life, if there were no *settled Establishment* belonging to it, and if you were to preach under the Cross, and in Danger of Persecution? for till you arrive at that, you are yet Carnal, and come into the Priesthood for a PIECE of BREAD. When you are in Orders, be ever ready to perform all Parts of your Function; *be not anxious about a Settlement*; study to distinguish yourselves in your Studies, Labours, exemplary Deportment, and a *just Sweetness of Temper*, managed with Gravity and Discretion; and as for what concerns yourselves depend on the Providence of God, for he will in due Time raise up Friends and Benefactors to you.—I do affirm this upon the Observation of my whole Life, that I never knew any one who conducted himself by these Rules, but he was brought into good Posts, or at least into an easy State of Subsistence.

Thus having remarked every Thing that appears to me

E 2

material

material in my Correspondent's Letter (tho' much more might be said upon the Subject) I refer it to the judicious Reader's Observation, that upon the Point in Dispute, (besides the Interest of the Nation) the Quakers have on their Side the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, the Practice of the primitive Church for several Centuries; and the Decrees of several eminent Councils as Occasion required. On which let me ask, whether or no these are not fair Reasons to induce them to think as they do, that *Tithes are perfectly inconsistent with Christianity, and therefore ought not to be enforced with human Laws.* For which Consideration, and because (according to our Author's own Concession, p. 26) *Human Faculties are Imperfect after we have done our best,* and also that the Clergy may have their whole Demands of the Quakers in a less grievous Manner if they will, I ask my candid and humane Reader, whether it is not highly reasonable that a *Stop* should be put to such cruel Men; who are still going on to harass and ruin their peaceable, honest and industrious Neighbours.

J. H.

Remarks

Remarks on T. B's. third Letter, in the Magazine for March 1738, wrote in Defence of Tithes.

OUR Author, instead of answering the Arguments advanced against Tithes in my last, raises a violent Clamour against me, as misrepresenting the *main Argument*.—The Point, says he, (1) upon which I engaged with you was, whether *Tithes are forced Contributions*. (2) In my Proof of the Affirmative, Tithes are considered as *PROPERTY unjustly taken from the People, and with which they never have been Easy, and are applied to Uses inconsistent with the Laws of Christ*. Now they are considered as *PROPERTY*, (without regarding how the Publick comes by it) which ought not to be settled by the State, exclusive of Religious Considerations: In both Cases therefore, as Tithes are supposed a Property claimed by the Government, the main Argument is not changed; 'tis only placed in a more advantageous Light, in which, if I had been concerned, my Antagonist ought to have thank'd me; for a Man will much sooner object against Tithes, when they are considered as *Property unjustly taken from him*, than when they are considered without that Representation; and what naturally led me to make this Construction of his Reasoning was, the Liberty he took with a Quotation from my Reply of June 1737, where I say, (p. 26) '*in my Opinion these Evils [attending severe Prosecutions] are really owing to the Error of upholding Tithes; for which Word Tithes, he substitutes the Word Property, and supposes his Anabaptist to argue (from religious Considerations) against Government having a Power to settle Property, with as much Reason as I argue against Tithes; thereby most evidently involving the Idea of Tithes in the general Idea of Property. One of these People would have told*

you

you (say he) (1) *as you do me*, 'that all the Evils of expensive Law Suits and Prosecutions are owing to the Error of upholding Property.—He might go on to urge, and perhaps *with as much Reason and Truth as YOU*, that all or most of the Property now claimed in the World, has at one Time or other been acquired by Force and Fraud, and what was wickedly acquired at first, must be reckoned a wicked Acquisition still.' Hence I collected his Sense and Drift to be, *That Government may settle Property as they please, without having any Regard to religious Considerations*; or, in other Words, that the Settlement of Property is a *meer Civil Concern*, and that it is of no Importance to the Subject to what Use the Publick shall appropriate it; the following Passage directly points to the same Principle, where, speaking of Tithes, he says, (2) 'Suppose that in your Opinion the Publick had disposed of them to a superstitious Use, how is your Conscience affected by it; if they are misapplied, the Fault is not yours; you cannot be reckoned a Supporter or Encourager of it; you only deliver up what you have no Pretence of Right to withhold, according to the Disposition of them who had the sole Right to dispose of it.' Now is not this most evidently giving up all regard to religious Considerations in the Subject? What then should induce this Gentleman so vehemently to disclaim his Principle, in the Beginning of his third (3) Letter? Probably because he was convinc'd by my last, that the primitive Christians would be thereby condemn'd, and Christian Morality liable to be defeated by the Government of Men. For if it is no Concern to private Persons how the Publick dispose of Property, the Subject ought to pay Tithes if appointed for the Support of *Publick Stews, Idolatry*, or any *Immoral Use*, as readily as if they were appropriated for the Support of the Civil Administration, or any the most unexceptionable Use whatever. Therefore our Author, after throwing some Dust in his Reader's Eyes, and embellishing his Epistle with (4) *Sarcasms* against me, (for with such Flowers of

1. *Mag. Sept.* 1737, p. 541:

2. *ibid.* p. 544.

3. *Mag. for March* 1738, p. 135.

4. *But how can I expect better Usage from him, since 'tis the common Treatment of Church Brethren towards one another in all*

of Rhetorick are all his Letters adorn'd, except the first) thinks it better to change his Principle, as he does in these Words, (1) 'God forbid (says he) that Government may settle Property as they please, without having any Regard to religious Considerations.—And I agree with you, that all Profits and Emoluments accruing to the Publick, for Want of private Owners, ought to be applied to some Service of the Publick *not inconsistent with the Laws of Christ.*' A generous Concession indeed! it only then remains to state what are the Laws of Christ respecting Ministers Maintainance, and whether the Settlement of Tithes interfere with those Laws or not; to which Purpose we have each of us given our Exposition of Scripture Texts, with this Advantage on my Side, that the Doctrine and Practice of the primitive Church, together with the moral Reason of the Thing, and the (2) Effects of Church Preferments in all Ages, are perfectly correspondent with it. And therefore what would it avail our Author, could he prove never so incontestibly, that *Tithes are free Contributions*; since, according to this new Principle, *Government could not settle them in a Manner inconsistent with the Laws of Christ.* But to avoid these, and all other Difficulties, his Sagacity has furnished him with this most admirable Expedient, That *the Publick must judge for themselves what is consistent with the Laws of Christ.* But this is recurring to his first exploded Principle again with very great Improvement; for then it follows, that Government may both *settle Property and Religion too as they please.* For the Publick to judge what is, or is not, consistent with the Laws of Christ, is directly to assert a Power superiour to Christ in his own Kingdom; for (2)

' whoever

Cases of Hetrodoxy; as a learned and judicious Dignitary of the Church asserts, when he says, 'Every mean Person, who has nothing to recommend him but his Orthodoxy, and owes that perhaps wholly to his Ignorance, will think he has a Right to trample on you with Contempt; to asperse your Character with virulent Reflections, to run down your Writings as mean and pitiful Performances, and give hard Names to Opinions he does not understand, which you must bear without the least Hope of being heard a Word in your Defence. Diff. and Disc. &c. p. 26.

1 Mag. Page 135. 2 Appendix.

3 Banger's Sermon of the Nature of the Kingdom of Christ, p. 12.

‘ whoever hath an absolute Authority to *interpret* any written or spoken Laws, it is he who is truly the Lawgiver to all Intents and Purposes, and not the Person who first wrote and spoke them.’ I say too that this new Principle, if it be true, cuts up Protestantism by the Roots, and justly condemns our Forefathers for making such an invincible stand against Popery as they did, upon the opposite Principle of distinguishing for themselves, and preferring what they apprehend to be the Laws of Christ before the Judgement of the Publick, and some of them on the very Subject we are upon. This learned Man is so peremptory as to stile this Notion of a publick Judge a *Natural Privilege*, and yet seems, in the very next Words, to allow, that it ought to extend to Particulars, by asserting, that the Quakers use it as much as the Publick; but how can it be said that the Quakers use it as much as the Publick, since they are liable to be ruined for their modest Descent from the Judgement of the Publick, whilst the Government may take their Demands of them in the most easy (legal) Manner that can be devised.

But it seems I have not distinguished between Taxes and Tithes, (considered as publick Property) and the Reason is, because I think there is no proper Distinction between them. Our Author thinks, that Tithes are the Property of the Publick; and I am not (1) alone in thinking, that all Estates belong to the Publick in Proportion as they are taxed. And therefore I look upon it to be very inconsistent to represent Tertullian against paying religious Taxes out of his own private Property, when at the same Time he allows that the Law laid a Claim to that Part of his Property. As therefore the Objection against paying such Taxes as these, is the very same at Bottom as against paying Tithes, it inevitably follows, that if Tertullian had purchased or hired a little Farm, embarrassed with any such outgoings as Tithes are, and applied to idolatrous Uses, he would not have paid *active Obedience* to such Laws; but not at all upon a Supposition that all Property must centre in the Saints, for such Notions as these honest Tertullian and the Quakers are as clear

Y See Debates in Parliament on the Tithes-Bill, Nov. Decem. 1736, p. 669, &c. Answer to Parsons Plea.

clear of as this Gentleman can possibly be; neither do they Reason like his Anabaptist, for they always distinguish betwixt the Settlement of Property in general, and that part which is taken from it for the use of the Clergy, so this Instance makes nothing for his purpose; besides I leave him to consider whether it be not as difficult to settle who are the *right Clergy* in one Case, as who are the *right Saints* in the other. But he thinks it strange that I should suppose Tertullian and the Primitive Christians would refuse to pay Taxes imposed on them, for the Maintenance of Churches devoted to the one true God: not at all, when it's consider'd that Christ has most evidently forbidden any such Things, and that (accordingly) the Primitive Christians did actually shew their dislike to all such Notions, as soon as occasion offer'd, as appears by all my preceeding Papers; and herein lies the Parity of the two Cases, (which this Author in his next Paragraph is so unwilling to admit) the Taxes just now specify'd, and Tithes are both appointed by Publick Authority to *unwarrantable Uses*, the one for the Support of Idolatry, a Religion so inconsistent with sound Reason, that a Christian could not yeild *active* Obedience to such a Law, tho' Christ himself is otherwise silent in the Case. Tithes (as I have abundantly shewn) are inconsistent with the Christian Laws, respecting Ministers Maintenance, and therefore *equally* unwarrantable; whilst the Precepts of Christ are of equal Authority with the Dictates of Reason, especially as Tithes are also inconsistent with the (1) Moral End proposed by them. Neither do I see how it can avail my Antagonist if it could be proved, (and which ought not to be brought as Argument, except our Author had proved) that a Jewish Convert living in Judea did not refuse paying to the Jewish Temple; inasmuch as the Tribe of Levi lost their share in the Land of Canaan, in Consideration of the Settlement of Tithes upon them, especially as Dr. Stillingfleet and others inform us, that the Christians for a considerable Time frequented the Temple Service, as not apprehending it to be inconsistent with Christianity. As to impropriate Tithes, my Correspondent says (2) they are confessedly apply'd to no religious uses; but as I have given (3) Instances to the

F. the

the contrary, which he has not refuted, 'tis needless for me to enlarge upon that Head, but refer him to T. Elwood's Account of impropriate Tithes, in the History of his Life, p. 22 to 32, and also to Elwood's Foundation of Tithes Shaken, p. 262, 3, 4, and Anthony Pearson's great Case of Tithes, (printed with J. Martin's Appendix) p. 62, 3, 4. especially as I have all along professed my Business to be chiefly with the Clergy, not doubting but if they could once be prevailed with to renounce Tithes, by embracing Primitive Christianity in Doctrine and Practice, or till then to come into moderate Measures for collecting them, all other Difficulties would soon be removed.

He says, I let pass his Assertion, that at the Reformation the Legislature disposed of Tithes freely, altho' I bestow'd a whole Paragraph (p. 22,) to refute that Assertion, to which he makes no Reply. I there shew (and also in my Reply, p. 38,) that it does not necessarily follow, that because Tithes were settled on the Clergy by Act of Parliament, that therefore they were *freely given by the People*, which is confirmed by an eminent Bishop of the Church of England, who grants that (1) *Laws are sometimes obtain'd by Surprise or Corruption, by party Management, by Craft or Superstition*. With equal Justice he charges me with arguing thus, that because Tithes were once forced Contributions, they must be so still, unfairly leaving out the middle Proposition which contains the Argument; for thus I Reason, (2) *As Tithes were introduced by force, and have been more or less supported by force, I mean by severe Laws, to this Day, to the injury and great dissatisfaction of the People, they may justly be said (more or less) to be forced Contributions still*. And as he never denies that Tithes have all along been supported by severe Laws, in effect he grants my Conclusion, that they are (more or less) forced Contributions still.

In short, the whole Merit of the Cause seems to rest upon this, whether I have truly stated what are the Laws of Christ, which I have executed with the utmost Sincerity, clear of any particular Views, as my Antagonist would suggest, and have shewn that my Construction is conformable to the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church,

Church, a long way downwards, which our Author does not Controvert; and my Exposition seems much the more feasible, as it may easily be made appear, to be most consistent with the Interest of Christianity by the flourishing State thereof, whilst these Laws were observed, and the most apparent Declension of it ever since. (1) On these Words *the Workman is worthy of his Meat*; my Comment runs thus. By the Word Meat, 'tis easy to conceive that *no more* was intended than that the Disciples might reasonably expect all necessary Accommodations of the People they preach'd to, *whilst their time was taken up in the work of the Ministry*, for we cannot extend it further without putting great Violence upon these remarkable Words of our Lord, Matth. x. 8. *freely you have received freely give*. (2) Yet our Tithe Advocate scruples not to assert, that according to my own Construction of this last Verse, Ministers may accept of what is freely given them, tho' it be *more than moderate Subsistence*, and that Christ do's not limit the bounds and good Will of the Society, or People among whom they Minister, to any certain Stint: Whereby he attempts to evade the most natural Import of these plain Words: to be commanded to give freely, implying in it self a Prohibition to accept of Rewards; tho' freely offer'd, further than what the Text expressly describes, which is only present Subsistence. It may suffice (3) in this Place to remind him of what I quoted from the Council of Antioch, where after the Bishop is enjoin'd to take no more to himself than what Necessity justly required, they alledge this restrictive Clause in the Words of St. Paul to Timothy, *having Food and Raiment let us be therewith Content*; as if they thought that Text imply'd a Prohibition upon them (and consequently upon any Community) to offer, as well as for Ministers to accept of *more than moderate Subsistence*; this too seems to be the Sense of the Council of Paris, Anno 829, held for the purging of Abuses, and restoring of primitive Discipline, where indeed they admit that a Minister should have a *competent Maintenance*, (4) but then the Question arises, says Bishop Burnet, *what is a competent Maintenance, this [the Canons] do all bring very low, to that*

F 2 which

1 Mag. Feb. 1738. p. 73. 2 Mag. March 1738. p. 136.

3 See further in the Appendix. 4 Pastoral Car. p. 79.

which can just maintain him. Such remarkable Restrictions as these upon Ministers, induce me to believe (contrary to what my Antagonist flatters himself) that Christ thought that the Ministers of his Word would be under such great Temptations by these plentiful Accommodations of Life, as to forfeit that Simplicity and Purity of Mind so requisite to their holy Call.

Those Scripture Texts, in the next Paragraph, equally affect all Christian Ministers, for as they all profess to be call'd by the (1) *holy Spirit*, while their Time is taken up (whether for a Week or their whole Lives it matters not) that they cannot conveniently follow any temporal Occupation, it would be unkind to let them want moderate Subsistence; for this is all the *constant Maintenance* recommended in the Gospel; but it is to be noted, that such a *constant Call for Life* is, generally speaking, besides the Pretensions of the primitive Ministers; those Africans who endeavoured to propagate such Notions being sharply rebuked by the Council of Carthage aforementioned, and enjoined to follow some honest Trade to bring them in Subsistence; for this was the good old way for them to come at Provender, when they were not treading out the Corn.

When I tell my Antagonist, (p. 33) that Timothy was not to expect a fine rich Bishoprick, tho' he might think it his Duty to dedicate himself intirely to the Service of the Ministry; he replies, (Mag. p. 137) but that is not the Point in Question, he might reasonably expect *constant Maintenance* which

1 Is it not surprising, that the Spirit should call a Man to the Ministry, and immediately desert him as soon as he is entered upon Duty? yet this seems to be our Author's Notion (p. 137) who is so inconsistent with himself as to attempt to put the Ridicule upon the Quakers for pretending to an occasional Call of the Spirit in the exercise of the Ministry, which the same holy Spirit call'd them to at first. Here permit me to observe, that in the early Ages of Christianity it was requisite, that every Person proposing to take upon himself that holy Function, should be of an orderly Life and Conversation, called by the holy Ghost, disposed to preach the Gospel freely, and be approved of by the Churches, that is the People; this was the Substance of primitive Ordination, and is the Quakers Credentials for preaching the Gospel now. — I wish the Clergy could say half so much for themselves.

which is the Point in Question. On which let me remind him, that this *constant Maintenance* was no more than Food and Raiment; tho' all Authors allow, that in the first Ages of Christianity the Church was very Rich by the free Offerings of the Faithful; so that had it not interfered with the Precepts of Christ, and the Interest of the Gospel, it's highly probable the Church would readily have allowed him a Revenue equivalent to a fine rich Bishoprick, and he would as readily have accepted it; for according to the present Tithe-Scheme (considering his eminent Station in the Church) he might reasonably expect it, and so it would be consistent with the Point in Question. But if the constant Maintenance of so great a Bishop as Timothy (who forbore to entangle himself with the Affairs of this Life) was to be no more than Food and Raiment, how can any Christian Minister since his Time justly think of more.

The Clergy may pretend to a Call for Lite, and 'tis true they enjoy their *Living*s so long, but are not engaged in the work of the Ministry scarce one seventh Part of their Time, so might easily follow some honest temporal Calling for their Subsistence, (as I have shewn in my Dissertation, p. 12.) which too is but agreeable to Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase upon Acts xx. 33, &c. in these Words, ' I have not endeavoured to make any worldly Advantage ' by my preaching, but you can witness for me, that I ' have, by working at my Trade of making Tents, maintained myself and these that were with me. I have, as ' by Words, so by Actions also, demonstrated to you, how ' that such as ye, that is, Bishops and Governours of the ' Church, are to take Care of the Sick and Poor, (see ' 1 Cor. 12.) and rather endeavour by Pains taking to enable yourselves to relieve others, than to be chargeable ' or burthensome to others, according to that saying of ' Christ (not recorded in the Gospel) that it is a blessed ' and heroical Thing to give to others out of a Man's own ' Earnings; and this is infinitely more blessed and better ' becoming a Christian, than to be relieved by others.' So remarkably inconsistent is the Doctrine of great Churchmen with their Practice.

The last Point my Correspondent has to settle with me is, about a proper Expedient to prevent the Evils produced by grievous Prosecutions for Tithes. My Scheme was that

that till the Clergy and the Quakers come to be of one Mind concerning Tithes, a Law should be made for taking all Tithes by Justice's Warrant only, whereby they would certainly and easily come at them; where then is the Insufficiency of it? But our Gentleman, instead of making any Reply to it, most notoriously evades the Point, and lays the Insufficiency of it upon the Laws now in Force, in which also he greatly wrongs the Law; for the compassionate Part of the Clergy know very well, that the Act of the 7th and 8th of King William, &c. made on Purpose for the Recovery of great and small Tithes by Justice's Warrant from the Quakers, are in many Cases very sufficient to adjust Vicarial and other Tithes.

On the other Hand, by what follows in this Paragraph, and the Conclusion of his Letter, it turns out at last, that after all his pretended Humanity to the Quakers, he cannot find in his Heart to propose any Thing else, but that they must be convinced by his ingenious Arguments in Defence of Tithes; with which I am well contented, provided he will admit my Scheme to take Place till this blessed Work is effected; but not a Word like this: For by all that I can see to the End of his Letter, he only attempts to beg some of the Points in Controversy, especially (his own *self exploded* Principle) *That Government may settle Property as they please, without any Regard to religious Considerations*, and advises them to do what he knows is defiling their Consciences, or else they are left to **FELL PERSECUTIONS SCOURGE**, notwithstanding their *peaceable Dispositions* as Neighbours, and their loyal Principle of *passive Obedience* and Nonresistance as Subjects.

It makes my Blood run Cold to think, that this is the Doctrine of one assuming the Character of a Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, that Gospel that was ushered into the World with a Declaration of *Glory to God on high, Peace upon Earth, and good Will unto Men.*

J. H.

Remarks

Remarks on T. B's. fourth Letter, in the Magazine for April 1738, wrote in Defence of Tithes.

I N Order to bring this Tithe Controversy to as short an Issue as possible, I desire my Reader to observe what I have said in my Paper, entitled (1) A DEFENCE; and then judge whether I have *easily drop'd* the five Texts of Scripture, or whether I have not rather duly considered all the material Texts relating to the Subject, and thereon *founded* my Arguments against Tithes: What I say further is (as I there declare, p. 34.) by way of Corroboration and Confirmation of my Construction of those Texts, and in such manner as is far from resting the Weight of my Reasoning upon the Authority of the Council of Carthage Only: altho' (according to the constant Method of ecclesiastical Disputes) if our Author's Cause would have admitted such like *Illustration*, it's highly probable that he would have declar'd it Conclusive against me; but so it happens, that the Council of Carthage (conformable to the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church for the first 200 Years) makes against him on this Occasion; and therefore it does not suit him to lay any Stress upon it: If he was not resolved to seem surprized, and to surprize his Reader on my reasoning from the Canons of late Councils, he would at least have added the Words which *immediately* follow from the eminent Bishop Burnet, who says, *the worse those Ages and Councils were, the stronger the Argument*, SINCE EVEN BAD MEN IN BAD TIMES COULD NOT JUSTIFY SUCH AN ABUSE.

I look upon it that the Sense and the Reasoning thereupon is the very same (and therefore the difference in Expression was imperceptible to me) to say that *Tithes cannot be taken away because the Hairs are extinct: or that they*

they cannot be restored to the People, because their Heirs cannot be found; for what do's he mean by arguing that they cannot be restored to the People, but that they cannot be taken away from the Clergy. But why can they not be restored to the People? The People (from whom they were originally taken) are not in being, and their Heirs (it seems, as he says,) cannot be found; how so, for since this Author (1) allows that at the Reformation the claim of the Popish Clergy to Tithes became void, they must of Course go either to such private Persons as were then in Possession of the other nine Parts, or to the Publick, chuse him whether? but why not to the first, since Possession is always reckoned a good Plea, till a better Title is shewn, and they were the nearest private Heirs to their Ancestors. (who had formerly been rook'd out of that part of their Property) which at that time could be found; and as restoring any thing to an Heir is the same as restoring it to his Parent, (since an Heir is a Parent's Representative) so in this Case restoring Tithes to the Persons left in Possession, is in a just Sense restoring them to the People from whom they were originally taken; which to me was always so plain a Case, that I had no Temptation to equivocate about it, as this learned Gentleman so wisely suggests: But he will have it that the Publick sell Heirs to National Tithes, by Virtue of which Heirship then, if the Government had a Power to settle them on any Set of Ministers, by the same Power (since they were not bought and sold) they may also unsettle them again, and so (without injury to any Man) may restore them again to the People. But this Author (2) grants that *Government may not settle them in a manner inconsistent with the Laws of Christ*, which is sufficient for me, for then it must issue upon this, What are the Laws of Christ, and who are the Judges thereof, the Decision of which Points I freely leave to my candid Reader's Judgment, after he has duly considered what has been said.

Our Author seems very unwilling to come upon Trial whether Tithes are settled *Equitably* or not, and positively refuses to touch upon Easter Offerings; I may therefore conclude, that these *personal Payments* are not only fundamentally

damentally wrong, but according to Instances in my former Letters, are at least altogether as unequal as prædial Tithes, and consequently severe Prosecutions thereupon utterly inexcusable.

As to the Discouragement Farmers are under respecting prædial Tithes, he hopes 'tis only owing to a Temper of Mind, and not to the Iniquity of the Law; but to convince his Readers of that, he should have made it appear, in answer to my Instances and reasoning thereupon, that the Law was not *unequal*.—That the Case respecting Tithe-free Lands is as I have (1) represented it, I appeal to the Judgement of *Common Sense*, and to the Occupiers of such Lands throughout the Kingdom. I do not say that any Markets are frequented by Farmers of Tithe-free Lands only; it is sufficient, that where there are large Tracts of Tithe-free Land intermix'd with others subject to Tithe, the Tithe-paying Farmers must sell their Corn dearer than their Neighbours, or feel the Disadvantage of it on many Accounts, as they frequently acknowledge.

For the clearing of this Tithe Subject, I all along proposed, and we mutually engaged to consider, what are the Laws of Christ, and what the Doctrine and Practice of the primitive Church, as well as whether *Tithes are forced Contributions or not*, tho' my Antagonist is pleased to call this the main Argument, and charges me with departing from it; but as to that, have not I also fully proved, that in some of the *darkest Ages of Popery* (2) *Tithes were first introduced into this Kingdom by Force and Fraud*—in a terrifying Manner; that (as an evident Token of their inequality) *the People have always been uneasy under them; that this uneasiness encreased at the Reformation, and that thereupon new Terror was brought upon the People by more severe Laws than ever*. Has there not been unequal Laws in all Nations? Did not the primitive Christians complain of such Laws? Besides, what I observed from (3) Bishop Hoadley, does not another of the same Rank freely
G assert,

1 Page 38. and Mag. March 1738, p. 122.

2 Dissertation p. 13. and Mag. June 1737, p. 324, 5, 6, and Mag. March 1732, p. 112.

3 Note in p. 47. and Mag. for March 1738;

assert, (1) *that a Thing is not Just and Reasonable because it is enacted, but in good Governments it is enacted because it is Just and Reasonable.* What can be a greater Token of the Inequallity of a Law, than a *general and continual Uneasiness*? Has this Author denied the Facts I go upon? or has he confuted my reasoning upon those Facts? How then have I departed from (2) the Point? I also obliged him in answering such Questions as he put to me; what then can he require more? He seems to be irritated when I tell him, that he has not resolved my Difficulties, and yet makes no Scruple to swell his Letters with Invectives and Insults against me: I will therefore conclude, with returning his own Words upon himself, where he says, (p. 175.) 'Consider, Sir, that you and I are Parties, not Judges; we state our Case, alledge our several Reasons, but which keeps closest to the Point, which argues most rationally or fairly, and speaks most to the Purpose, must be left to the Judgement of the impartial Reader.'

J. H.

1 *Difficulties and Discouragements*, p. 28:

2 *See also the Beginning of my last Paper.*

APPENDIX.

OUR Tithe-Advocate in order to support his Conjecture, that it was not Christ's Intention to restrain Ministers from accepting of *more than moderate Subsistence*; (being well apprised that the Doctrine and Practice of the purest Ages of Christianity are against him) argues thus. (1) 'I believe [Christ] thought the Ministers of his Word would be as capable and as willing to make a good use of the plentiful Accommodations of Life as other Men.' Wherefore if on the contrary it appears, that these plentiful Accommodations of Life, these *free Gifts* as this Writer affects to account Tithes and all Church Endowments, have been apparently hurtful to Ministers, and to the Christian Religion; it will follow, that Christ really intended such Restriction. A few Instances will suffice to clear this Point. (2) 'A Bishoprick (saith the eminent Dr. Taylor) would satisfy the two Designs of Covetousness and Ambition; and this hath been the golden Apple very often contended for, and very often the Cause of great Fires in the Church. Thebulis quia rejectus ab Episcopatu Hierosolymitano turbare cepit Ecclesiam, said Egippus in Eusebius. Tertullian turned Montanist in Discontent for missing the Bishoprick of Carthage, after Agrippinus; and so did Montanus himself for the same Discontent, said Nicephorus. Novatus would have been Bishop of Rome, Donatus of Carthage, Arrius of Alexandria, Acrius of Sebastia; but they all mis'd, and therefore all of them vexed Christendom. And this was so common a Thing, that oftentimes the threatening the Church with a Schism or a Heresy was a Design to get a Bishoprick; and Scocrates

G. 2

crates reports of Asterius, that he did frequent the Conventicles of the Arrlans. *Nam Episcopatum aliquem ambiebat.* (1) Again, the ingenious and impartial Dr. Samuel Chandler, speaking of the grand Sources of Persecution hath these Words, 'Without any Breach of Charity it may be asserted of most, if not all of, [the Bishops and Clergy] that it was their Pride, and their immoderate love of Dominion, Grandeur and Riches, that influenced them to these unworthy and wicked Measures.—Even long before the Time of Constantine, the Clergy had got a very great Ascendant over the Laity, and grew many of them Rich by the voluntary Oblations of the People; but the Grants of that Emperor confirmed them in a worldly Spirit, and the Dignities and vast Revenues that were annexed to many of the Sees, gave rise to *infinite Evils and Disturbances*, so that could they but get Possession of them they cared not by what Means, whether by clandestine Ordinations, scandalous Simony, the Expulsion of the Possessors, or thro' *the Blood of their Enemies.*' Much to the same Purpose are these Words of the learned Dr. Burnet, (2) 'As soon as the Empire became Christian, the Authority, the Immunity, and the *other Advantages*, which by the Bounty of Princes followed the sacred Function, made them to be generally much desired; and the Elections being then for the most Part popular, these were managed with much Faction and Violence, which often ended in Blood, and that to so great an Excess, that if we had not Witnesses to many Instances of this among the best Men in those Ages, it would look like an uncharitable Imputation on those Times to think them capable of such Enormities.'

From those Times to these it would be endless to run into particular Instances of the Clergy's notorious Abuse of Riches and Power more than all other Men; the Histories of all Nations are full of them. To this is justly to be ascribed the Establishment of Popery; a Religion, in many Respects, worse than the worst of all that has ever been call'd so since the World began. 'It was (says (3) Rapiq

1 *History of Persecutions*, p. 415, 417. 2 *Pass. Cave, Pref.*

3 *Hist. of Eng. 1st Vol.* p. 693.

(3) Rapin) the Popes, the Cardinals, and the principal
 Clergy, who opposed to their utmost the Reformation,
 [in England] *because they were sensible it would prove pre-
 judicial to their temporal Interest.* But behold how these
 plentiful Accommodations of Life illuminate the humane
 Understanding; as soon as the Parliament had resolved to
 new model Religion, the Clergy readily became Converts
 to Protestantism (notwithstanding the (1) Disapprobation
 they had expressed) *rather than quit their Preferments.*
 These and such like Matters are well represented in a
 Pamphlet entitled *A short View of the Conduct of the Eng-
 lish Clergy, so far as relates to civil Affairs, from the Con-
 quest to the Revolution.* That Author goes upon incontest-
 ible Facts, and introduces his Performance thus, (p. 2.)
 'Whoever looks into our ancient Histories will find, the
 Clergy have been always guided by a distinct Interest of
 their own, most frequently contrary to that of the Na-
 tion: Instead of asserting the Liberty of the People,
 they have been most instrumental in all Attempts to de-
 stroy it; instead of propagating generous Notions of
 Freedom, they have constantly endeavoured to instil into
 the Minds of Men the most slavish Maxims, and taught
 Lessons of the most blind and abject Submission. Their
 Opposition to Power (whenever they have made any)
 has generally been Factionous and Selfish, not grounded
 on Motives of Regard for the Good of the Common-
 Wealth, but occasioned by some Attempt upon their
 temporal Interest or Privileges, which was often no
 other than a just Intention of Retrenching their Encroach-
 ments upon the Crown and People. Accordingly we
 may observe, that the most dangerous Designs against
 the Publick, have been form'd by such of our Princes,
 who begun with securing the Clergy to their Interest, by
 great Condescensions to them, for we seldom find the
 Clergy to have failed returning the Complement by a
 Concurrence in promoting the most arbitrary Attempts
 by their Doctrine and Actions. The Use the Clergy
 have made of what Power they have acquired under such
 Princes, has always been most insupportable to the
 Laity, especially to such as have opposed it.'

As

As from these Authorities it appears that Church Preferments have in all Ages been of a most baneful Tendency, I may fairly conclude (according to my Antagonist's own way of arguing) that Christ our Lord intended an absolute Prohibition of them in these Words *freely you have received freely give*:

But I cannot conclude without briefly representing the Mischief of Ecclesiastical Preferments, as they are inseparably annexed to Subscriptions of Articles of Faith, which perhaps not one Clergyman in a hundred sufficiently believes. Is it not perfectly shocking to think, that a Man must be obliged to renounce his Integrity (the Root of all Virtues) before he can be qualified to recommend it to others? (1) 'The requiring Subscriptions to the 39 Articles (says Dr. Burnet) is a great Imposition;—the greater Part [of the Clergy] subscribe without ever examining them, and others do it because they must do it, though they can hardly satisfy their Consciences about some Things in them. Churches and Societies are much better secured by Laws than by Subscriptions; it's a more reasonable as well as a more easy Method of Government.'

That upright Man W. Whiston, in his Historical Memoirs of the Life of Dr. Clark, in many Places most pathetically laments, and honestly rebukes (2) 'such as sign and use (these are his Words) what they do not, they cannot, really believe to be true and right, to the great Scandal of Religion, the Reproach of that sacred Function to which they belong, and to the spreading of Infidelity and Profaneness in the World. O! my Soul come not thou into their Secrets! to their Assembly mine Honour be not thou united!

Also the ingenious Author of the *Enquiry into the Causes of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest*, no less movingly complains of these Truth and Virtue killing Impositions; when he says, p. 15, 'This Subscription is absurd, because it absolutely prevents all Searches and Enquiries after Truth, and only tends to shackle the Mind, or to betray it into Vice. It does not keep any out of the Church,

1 *Burnet's Conclusion to the History of his own Times.*

2 *Memoirs*, p. 72.

Church, but Men of Honesty and Integrity, for those either of no Principles, or very unstable ones, will not scruple it, and then it does not avoid *Diversities of Opinion*, but encourages the very worst of all Opinions, that a Man may subscribe any Thing for a LIVING.' He afterwards acknowledges as one Cause of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest, that some of their Ministers are forced to go into the Church (*against their Consciences*,) because they cannot get a livelihood amongst their own Brethren.

These are sore Evils, and they all cry out, how must we prevent them? How! say I, why are ye all so blind? give up Church Preferments, and return again to the *primitive Institution of the Ministry*, as described in the preceding Pages, and Subscriptions, with all their black Train of tremendous Evils, will fall of Course, for then the Temptation ceases.

[. H.]

F I N I S.
